

Response:

The applicant appreciates that the examiner has indicated that claims 8 to 15 and 23 are allowable.

The applicant has amended claim 6 and canceled claim 7 to address the objections set forth in the first numbered paragraph of the office action. Accordingly, it is the applicant's opinion that this matter has been addressed.

The examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5-7, 16, 21, 22, and 24 as being anticipated by Vollkommer et al. or Peterson et al. Applicant respectfully traverses that rejection.

Vollkommer discloses pentabromobenzyl-2-hydroxyethylether as being suitable for being an intermediate to prepare polyformals. That compound is not disclosed, suggested or taught to be a flame retardant compound by itself. That compound is formed into a distinct polymer.

The examples in the present application illustrate the preferred embodiments for the invention. Those preferred embodiments illustrate that when $k=0$ then R_1 could be (C_3-C_{10}) alkylene-OH. Accordingly, the applicants amended this application to incorporate the disclosure set forth in the examples. Thus, Vollkommer does not teach or suggest the same compounds as set forth in the instant claims, and therefore, the rejection should be rescinded.

Peterson mentions a pentabromobenyl allyl ether. That compound, however, is not claimed in the instant claims. In claim 1, for example, the compound can have an allyl only when $k=1$, in which case the side chain of pentabromobenzyloxy would not be allyl but alkyleneoxy-allyl. Thus, Peterson does not teach or suggest the same compounds as set forth in the instant claims, and therefore, the rejection should be rescinded.

It is respectfully submitted that the amended claims in conjunction with the response to the office action

render the instant claims patentable. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request the examiner allow these claims as presented.